R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 010 358 48

LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD--SINO-TIBETAN FASCICLE TWO.

BY- VOEGELIN, C. F. VOEGELIN, FLORENCE M.
INDIANA UNIV., BLOOMINGTON

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-63-11 PUB DATE MAR 65
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-9488
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.52 63P. ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS, 7(3)/1-57, MARCH 1965

DESCRIPTORS- *SINO TIBETAN LANGUAGES, *CHINESE, THAI, *LANGUAGES, ARCHIVES OF LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

THIS REPORT CONTAINS A PAPER ON RYUKYUAN-JAPANESE LANGUAGE DIVERSITY AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE LANGUAGES OF THE KHAM-THAI FAMILY FOUND IN THAILAND, CAMBODIA, LAOS, VIETNAM, INDIA, AND SOUTHEAST CHINA. (THE REPORT IS PART OF A SERIES, ED 010 350 TO ED 010 367.) (JK)

ED010358

63-11

PART I

Anthropological Linguistics

Volume 7 Number 3

March 1965

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Title

LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD:

SINO-TIBETAN FASCICLE TWO

A Publication of the
ARCHIVES OF LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD
Anthropology Department
Indiana University

ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS is designed primarily, but not exclusively, for the immediate publication of data-oriented papers for which attestation is available in the form of tape recordings on deposit in the Archives of Languages of the World. This does not imply that contributors will be restricted to scholars working in the Archives at Indiana University; in fact, one motivation for the publication of ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS is to increase the usefulness of the Archives to scholars elsewhere by making publishable data and conclusions and their tape recorded attestation more widely available. (Recorded attestation of papers from scholars elsewhere will be copied by the Archives and the original recordings returned to the collector; others may then work with the tape copy either in the Archives or elsewhere by having a copy sent to them.) In addition to heavily exemplified papers in the form of preliminary or final statements on restricted problems in phonemics, morphophonemics, morphemics, syntax and comparative grammar, ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS will include lexical lists and analyzed texts (especially in the otherwise hard-to-publish range of 20 to 100 pages) and theoretical and methodological papers (especially in the form of papers from symposia).

Each volume of ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS consists of nine numbers to be issued during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, October, November and December. Subscriptions ($3.50 a year) and papers for publication should be sent to the editor, Dr. Florence M. Voegelin, Anthropology Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter at the postoffice
at Bloomington, Indiana

[The following communication was sent to us in the form of a personal letter, unselfishly giving us specialist information to include in our revision of Languages of the World: Boreo-Oriental Fascicle One, 5. Japanese and Okinawan, AL 7.1.115-21, 1965. In our reply to the writer that we would indeed use his information in this way, we also requested that he permit us to publish it under his own name, and he gave his permission to do so. Ed.]

IMPRESSIONS OF RYUKYUAN-JAPANESE DIVERSITY

W. W. Elmendorf

Washington State University

First, on the use of 'Okinawan' to denote all dialects found in the Ryukyu Islands. Okinawa is one island of a long, chain-like archipelago. Although centrally located in the chain, relatively large, and historically important (as center of a former native kingdom), it is neither a linguistic unit, nor are its dialects intelligible everywhere in the Ryukyus.

While on Okinawa during 1951-2 I was in the army, recalled as a reservist to active duty, and assigned as head of a branch in the Civil Education and Information section of the American military government (USCAR). I had a good deal of contact with persons from different parts of Okinawa, as well as elsewhere in the Ryukyus, and was able (at that time) to communicate with them fairly effectively in Japanese. I was informed by a large number of people that enough difference existed between dialects at the extreme north end of the island and the rest of Okinawa so that communication was difficult between them. Dialect differences appeared everywhere in southern Okinawa also, but not such as to interfere with intelligibility. However, markedly distinct forms of speech were said to occur on closely adjacent islets, as Kudaka off the SE end of Okinawa. I have no measure of how marked the distinctions were. But 'Okinawan' as a linguistic term would at best denote a rather diversified group of dialects, probably confined to Okinawa and a few closely adjacent smaller islands.

Then, it appeared that there were native forms of speech in the Ryukyu chain, mutually unintelligible with each other and with 'Okinawan'.

Some distance north of Okinawa, with a few small inhabited islands in between, is the Amami group, with Amami Ōshima the principal island. The barber who cut my hair in Naha, Okinawa, where I was stationed, was a native of Amami and a native speaker of an Amami Ōshima dialect. He told me (in Japanese): (1) Dialect differences existed within the Amami group, but with interdialect intelligibility. (2) He was unable to understand Okinawans conversing in their own dialect(s), and himself talked to Okinawans only in Japanese.

After a considerable water gap south of Okinawa, the southern Ryukyus (formerly called Sakishima Rettō) run roughly southwestward toward Formosa. At the end of the chain the quite isolated island of Yonaguni is within sight of the mountains of northern Formosa (and this was on a not very clear day). This

group is made up of three fairsized islands and a number of smaller ones, some well separated from the rest. William Burd, then a graduate student at the University of California, collected linguistic data on Miyako, the northernmost island of the group, and wrote up a grammatical sketch of the dialect. He told me, on Okinawa, that he was sure Miyako dialect would be mutually unintelligible with any Okinawa dialect. This opinion was later confirmed by a Miyako native working in the CIE section on Okinawa.

Allan H. Smith of this department (currently with NSF), and his wife, did two extended seasons of ethnographic field work in a small village, Kabira (locally [kə́bř̆ə́]), on Yaeyama, another of the southern islands. The second of these field trips was during the spring and summer of 1952, while I was on Okinawa. Allan's prime objective was ethnography, but he did collect a considerable amount of linguistic materials, including comparative vocabularies from several parts of the Ryukyus. He was certain that the Kabira dialect of Yaeyama was definitely not mutually intelligible with any Okinawan dialect. This impression was confirmed by a very intelligent secretary in my office, Kitty Yafuso, a native Okinawan, who had accompanied the Smiths briefly into the field on Yaeyama.

Thus, these (admittedly impressionistic) observations suggest that Ryukyuan (not Okinawan) native speech falls into at least three mutually unintelligible groups of dialects, centering respectively in the northern (Amami), central (Okinawa), and southern (Miyako-Yaeyama) islands of the chain. We should probably speak of the Ryukyuan languages, forming with Japanese a closely related language family, in which the maximum linguistic differences are probably slightly greater than among the present-day Romance descendants of Latin. It is pretty clearly not a question of relating one 'Okinawan' language to one other, Japanese, sister language.

Implicit in this hypothetical subgrouping arrangement is the centering of linguistic diversity (within the Japanese-Ryukyuan family) in the Ryukyu archipelago. Within Japanese, one may add, some data suggest greatest dialect diversity, or greatest dialect distances, in the south (Kyushu).

Of course, all this should be subjected to rigorous dialect-distance testing throughout the Japanese-Ryukyuan speech area, as well as controlled vocabulary and morphology comparisons.

Let me add one other linguistic, or sociolinguistic, fact about Ryukyuan speech habits, which struck me forcibly during the year I was there. School instruction and nearly all writing is conducted in Japanese. All official business, e.g. with the U.S. authorities (as formerly with their Japanese counterparts) is carried on through Japanese, as is governmental business in the native legislature (in Naha, Okinawa), in town councils, and in relatively informal meetings of the heads of village families.*

In other words, Japanese has become a second language for all Ryukyuans (except for a handful of aged monolinguals), which now tends to be used in all situations except strictly domestic ones. The position of the average Ryukyuan with respect to his local form of speech vis-a-vis the Japanese language seems much like that of the average German-speaking Swiss with respect to his local

* The best brief description known to me of a typical Ryukyu language situation is Allan H. Smith, The Culture of Kabira, APS-P 104:2.134-71 (1960), p. 139.

dialect vis-a-vis Standard German. The linguistic differences in the former case are almost certainly greater (i.e. between a local Ryukyuan dialect and Japanese), however. We might describe the Swiss situation as one of diglossia; in the Ryukyus an imposed and historically intrusive (though related) language serves the function of 'upper level' speech.

One result of this is that today — or at least, 13 years ago — most Ryukyuans have come to equate Japanese speech forms with the public, literate, formal, official, or polite sides of social behavior. Thus, if one asks for the real, native, Okinawan pronunciation of some place name, one will inevitably receive a Japanese equivalent, sometimes a literal translation of the native term into Japanese, sometimes a sort of phonological Japanesing of the native term by a one-to-one substituting of Japanese for (supposedly) equivalent Okinawan phonemes. At first I thought this indicated rapid morpheme replacement, of native by Japanese forms. Nothing of the kind. The native form would be used by anyone speaking Okinawan, but of course you don't speak Okinawan to strangers; to them you use Japanese, because Japanese forms are polite, literate, educated forms, which ought to go on a map, be related to strangers with whom one is formal, etc.

I have had great trouble (until I came to know the informant well) in eliciting the first ten numerals from (fluent) native speakers of Okinawan dialects, who invariably start by giving Japanese forms (or course, politely, to a stranger, who was eliciting through the medium of Japanese). And this is not because of discontinuance of the native numeral forms; just that those forms would sound strange or awkward or embarrassing in that context. This should be kept in mind in appraising any Japanese-Ryukyuan vocabulary comparisons — in many cases we are quite unsure of the extent to which the Ryukyuan list cites purely native forms.

It is earnestly hoped that the excellent beginning already made by Japanese linguists in the study of Ryukyuan speech be continued and expanded in the future.

LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD:
SINO-TIBETAN FASCICLE TWO

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin

Indiana University

2.0. Introduction and list of Kham-Thai languages

2.1. Thai sentences

2.2. Sample of phonologies of Kham-Thai languages

For authorship and sponsorship, see Languages of the World: Sino-Tibetan Fascicle One (C.1). The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

THE KAM-THAI FAMILY

2.0. Languages of the Kam-Thai family are found not only in Thailand but also in Laos, in Vietnam, in southeast China, in Burma, in Cambodia, and in India (Assam). These languages are flooded with words borrowed from neighboring or distant donor languages belonging to different language families.

There is, besides, general westernizing acculturation in Kam-Thai societies, acculturation of long standing, stemming largely from China and India. Parallel to this general acculturation, Chinese is, linguistically, the most important donor language for the Northern Kam-Thai languages, and Pāli (the Old Indic Prakrit) or Buddhistic Sanskrit is the most important donor language for Southwestern Thai languages, but a modern Indic language, Bengali, was also a donor of words to the Kam-Thai language spoken in Assam. From languages of the Cambodian or Mon-Khmer family some Kham-Thai languages borrowed two-syllable words, while longer polysyllabic words were borrowed largely from Buddhistic Sanskrit. Whether or not Vietnamese is a member of the Mon-Khmer family, Vietnamese is a donor language for Kam-Thai languages spoken in Vietnam. So also, Burmese is a donor language to the Kam-Thai language spoken in Burma.

Discounting these diverse sources of borrowing, the languages of the Kam-Thai family do not seem very divergent. The linguistic differences among them permit them to be placed in three main groups (I, II, III, below).

Thai proper may be the only language of the group that has a continuing extensive living literature, written in a devanagari. All devanagaris are derived ultimately from India, but some varieties of devanagari were most immediately derived from Cambodia.

And in the north, the devanagari used for writing Tai-blanc of Phu has been so influenced by the Chinese direction of writing that the devanagari is written up and down (vertically) — a unique instance of this writing direction for devanagaris and a very peculiar one, since devanagari is entirely different in type from Chinese character writing. The latter includes some specification of sounds embedded in logograms which specify the logos (words or parts of words, as members of compounds — or more briefly, the morphemes). On the other hand, all the different devanagaris specify consonants and associated vowels, somewhat like letters of the Latin alphabet, which specify consonants and vowels co-ordinately.

This prefatory section is followed by a sample of Thai sentences (2.1, below), and by a summary of differences in sounds among Kam-Thai languages (2.2, below), with citation from the languages given in Latin letters rather than in any of the devanagaris, of which more than one variety exists, and rather than in Chinese characters which are used for writing some northern languages. Some Kam-Thai languages are not written by their preliterate speakers; these are, of course, written in Latin letters by investigators.

Some indication of known dialect variants for some of the languages listed is given in the following enumeration of Kham-Thai languages in I, The

Southwestern group (Tai-Shan languages); II, The Central group (Nung -Tho languages); III, The Northern group (Kam-Sui languages). This has become a generally accepted grouping for Kam-Thai languages, but, of course, any one of the three groups may be further subdivided; as is done by a Russian source (Morev et al, 1961) which subdivides group I into (a) Northwestern and (b) Southern groups, co-ordinate with groups II and III.

I. The Southwestern group (Tai-Shan languages) includes several languages spoken in China and in north Vietnam, and a few languages spoken in Burma, Laos (Lao), and in Thailand. Language names attributed to this group are not guaranteed to represent separate languages. Indeed some 'languages' are supposed to be mutually intelligible with others, and, hence, dialects of one language. Others may once have been equally similar but, because of heavy borrowing from different donor languages, are no longer so. Hence, they would be classified as separate languages, but not in the usual sense of having diverged from a parent language in different directions. The inventories of sound distinctions made by the following languages (2.2, below) show few differences.

(1) Thai (or Tai or Dai or Siamese) includes the Standard Bangkok dialect, as well as other dialects around the Chao Phraya River in the central plain of Thailand as far north as Uttaradit and immediately to the east of this area. The southern Thai dialects spoken in the Thailand part of the Malay peninsula, said to be the most conservative dialects in Thailand (Egerod, 1961), may or may not represent the same language; the current general southern spoken

standard, differing from the Bangkok standard largely in tone, certainly does. Estimates based on the 1957 census of Thailand gave ten million as the number of speakers of the central, including southern, dialect, and one million speakers of the eastern or Thai Khorat dialect.

(2) Yuan (Thai Yuan, Yon), spoken in the Lānnā or Phāyap region of Thailand, is sometimes treated as a northern dialect of the same language as Thai, above. Egerod lists Yuan together with Khŭn and Lŭ, (3) and (4) below, as a Northern sub-group of the group I languages. Estimates based on the 1957 census of Thailand give two million as the number of speakers of northern dialects spoken in Thailand, hence presumeably of Yuan.

(3) Khŭn is spoken in the state of Kengtung in the Eastern Shan State area of Burma.

(4) Lŭ is spoken in the southern part of Yunnan, with some speakers in adjacent Laos. "This group forms a semi-independent state in China with an area of about 2500 sq. kilometers and an estimated population of about two hundred thousand of which about forty per cent consists of other ethnic groups" (Li, 1964). The state is called Sipsong Panna; its capital is Ceng Hung. Li (1964) concludes that Lŭ and Tai Blanc, (5) below, "may be considered as close dialect variants."

(5) Tai Blanc (or White Tai) is spoken in northwestern Vietnam along the China border — not to be confused with Tay (Blanc) of group II in northeastern Vietnam. (Both appear as Tai or Tay; we follow Li 1959 in distinguishing their spellings.)

(6) Lao (or Laotian) of Laos includes dialects which are more or less intelli-

gible with Thai dialects spoken in the greater part of the eastern bulge of Thailand bordering on Laos. There were estimated in 1960 to be one million Lao proper (Lao Lum or Valley Lao) in Laos and five million Lao or Thai of the Northeast in Thailand (1957 census). In addition, by 1950 there were estimated to be 20,000 Lao and Thai in the northern provinces of Cambodia. Egerod (1961) liststhese dialects asan Eastern sub-group of group I languages, which would possibly include (7), below.

(7) Tai Noir (or Black Tai) is spoken in northern Vietnam, along the Laos border, as well as in Laos. The Tai Noir have adapted (and simplified) writing from Laos. If the percentage of lowland tribal Thai (Lao-Tai) in relation to the total population in Laos has remained relatively constant over the last forty years, as the percentage of other groups in Laos seem to have done, and if all may be classified as Black Tai (Tai Dam in Laos), then there are some 300,000 Black Tai in Laos. The Laotian government's efforts to minimize ethnic distinctions by listing togéther all Thai speaking peoples (and providing only one language, Lao, in schools and courts) makes it difficult to establish population figures for tribal groups.

(8) Shan (Thai Yai) languages or dialects are spoken in the Shan States of Burma and Yunnan, with some speakers in the adjacent Mae Hong Son area of northwest Thailand. According to the 1931 census of Burma there were then some 1,037,406 speakers of eleven different Shan dialects in Burma. In 1957 the Burmese government estimated the total population of Burma at a figure over 1/ 3 larger than the 1931 total, but part of the increase was due to includ-

ing areas not included in the 1931 census, so if the Shan increased proportionately they might be assumed to have increased 30 %, totalling now perhaps 1,350,000. This figure, however, probably includes the speakers of other Kam-Thai languages in Burma, as the Khampti (9), below. If 'Shan' represents one language, rather than several, it includes (9) and (10) below.

(9) Khampti (or, with the letter h written before the k, Hkamti, Khampti Shan or Sam) shows considerable dialect differentiation, and a wide distribution. There is a North Burma dialect, a Sinkaling Hkamti dialect, and an Assam dialect.

(10) Yunnan Shant'ou is described in Chinese characters as "12 districts Shan". The Chinese Shans are also called Thai Chè, Thai Khè Tayok and Paiyi. In 1956 there were estimated to be 470,000 Paiyi in south-western and southern Yunnan. But 'Paiyi' is used by Chinese for a number of Thai groups, including those who are not 'Shan', e.g. the Lü, (4) above.

(11) Ahom was spoken in Assam, India. Our sources do not agree entirely. Ahom is said to have become extinct in the 18th (19th?) century; to be still spoken though not as a natural language, but as a language of religion; to have levelled with other dialects still spoken in Assam and, therefore, traces of it can be studies as a natural language (Grierson, 1920).

II. The Central group (Nung-Tho languages) includes several Kam-Thai languages, some spoken on one side, some on the other side, and some on both sides of the China-Vietnam border.

(1) Nung is spoken by some 170,000 people in northern Vietnam (not to be confused with north Burma Nung or Salween Valley Nung in western Yunnan). A dialect close to Vietnam Nung is spoken in and around Lung-chow in south China.

(2) Tho (Thu or T'u): but T'u may also be different in dialect than Tho. The name Tho is not a self-designation for the language; the speakers are often called Tho because the Vietmanese call the mountain people thổ-nhân the aborigines.

(3) Li (Lai, La, Loi, Le, Dli, B'li, B'lai, K'lai, S'lai, S'ai, Hiai), Laqua, Lati, and Kelao (Keh-lao, Thu — which may represent the T'u above (4)) are spoken in the interior of Hainan Island (Li), in the southern part of Kwangsi province in China and in northern Vietnam. These are the languages grouped by Benedict (1942) as a separate 'Kadai stock', related to Kam-Thai, Austronesian, Mon Khmer, Vietmanese, and possibly Miao-Yao in an 'Austric' phylum. It seems clear, however, that these 'Kadai' languages are members of the Kam-Thai family which have borrowed heavily not only from Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian) languages, but also from Mon Khmer languages. Sufficient information to certainly classify Li in the Kam-Thai family is available; information on the other of the four (or more) languages in this group is extraordinarily scanty. So little

linguistic data is available for these languages that it is impossible to say how many languages are represented — there may be four (the four names listed above); there may be two, Li-Laqua and Lati-Kelao (Benedict's two divisions of Kadai); or there may be more than four if the differences between Northern Li and Southern Li and Northern Kelao and Southern Kelao are as great as Benedict suggests. In 1956 there were estimated to be 360,000 Li on Hainan Island.

Fang-Kuei Li (1959) also treats separately or co-ordinately:

(4) Tay (Blanc) spoken in the northeast corner of Vietnam, and the dialects spoken in the southeastern Chinese districts of

(5) Yung-ch'un and

(6) T'ien-pao.

III. The Northern group (Kam-Sui languages) includes Kam-Thai languages spoken in China that are contiguous to some of the group II languages (see above) or are north and northwest of the group II languages. But various dialects of Kui (also known in the literature by the dialect names of 'Jui and 'Joi and Dioi and Kŭei and Gui), for example, are widely distributed not only in southeast China, but also in Laos and in Thailand. The languages and dialects of the northern group III show more consonant distinctions or different distinctions than Thai and other languages of group I; and they show generally fewer vowel distinctions in any one system. But, like languages in the central group II, group III includes languages with two co-existent vowel systems— one vowel subsystem for short vowels which make different contrasts than a second vowel subsystem for long vowels (2.2, below). Further work is needed before a final distinction between dialects and separate languages can be made.

The list of language names which follows is, then, very preliminary.

(1) Kam (T'ung).

This Kam language is not to be confused with a language spoken in Vietnam, Cham, which belongs to the Malayo-Polynesian family, though it includes borrowings from languages of the Kam-Thai family, as from Vietnamese. In 1956 there were estimated to be 710,000 Tung in the area where Kweichow, Hunan, and Kwangsi meet.

(2) Mak (Mo-Hwa-Chi-Lyo), perhaps including the Ching (Cham) dialect.

The name Mak appears to be Anglicized from Mo-Chia, a dialect of Mak spoken in Kwangsi Province (see 2.2, below). Mak speakers are closer in culture to speakers of Chung Chia than to speakers of Sui whose language is more like their ow

(3) Sui includes dialects spoken in the southeast of Kweichow province. Though (2) Mak and (3) Sui are linguistically similar (Sui makes some consonant distinctions not found in Mak) persons in the Mak culture and persons in the Sui culture by no means consider themselves to be members of the same society. There are dialect variations in Sui, too, but Sui speakers of whatever dialect do not intermarry with speakers of Chungchia (Chung Chia), as do Mak speakers.

(4) Yang Huang (T'en).

(5) Kui (Jui, Gui, etc.) is a northern Kam-Thai language of group III, and is not to be confused with a language in the Mon-Khmer family which is also called Kui. In Kweichow province, Kui is called Chungchia; in the Kwangsi province, it is called Chuangchia; but the polite name that is used in the Chinese literature for Kui tribes is generally I-chia meaning minority hill tribes. The self-designation of the Kui varies according to dialect, and is reflected in the variants found in

the literature: Jui, 'Jui, 'Joi, Dioi, Kŭei, Gui, γui. Kui dialects are found in three provinces of China (Kwangsi, Kweichow, and Yunnan), and in addition in Thailand and Laos. Dialects spoken in the districts whose names are given under (8) through (11), below, are linguistically closer to each other than they are to the dialects spoken in the districts numbered (6) and (7), but any of these may represent dialects of languages listed above.

(6) Wu-ming is classified by Fang-Kuei Li as belonging to group III. It is said by other sources to be a dialect of a language called Chuang[4] (belonging to group III), but Chuang and Chungchia are often used indiscriminately for dialects spoken in south China which are also known as Hsia or Shia, some of which, but not the Wu-ming dialect, may belong to group II. In 1956 there were estimated to be 6,610,000 Chuang in the Kwangsi Chuang Autonomous Region of China, and 1,240,000 Chungchia or Puyi in the P'an-chiang valley in southwestern Kweichow.

(7) Ch'ien-chiang.

(8) Ts'e-heng.

(9) Ling-yŭn.

(10) Hsi-lin.

(11) T'ien-chow.

2.1. The notation used for 'acquired Mandarin' is adapted to the following Thai sentences. The order is again free translation, followed by the numbered sentence in Thai, followed by glosses for each Thai morpheme. Phrase brackets enclose the glosses, rather than formulae which are used in discussion of some Thai sentences (namely, always major (M), or always

minor (m) morphemes vs. morphemes which function as major ($\frac{M}{m}$) in one phrase, but minor ($\frac{m}{M}$) in another).

The streets in this town are very narrow.

(1) t'ànŏn nāy mɨaŋ ní· kæ̂·p ma·k

[street]$_a$ [in classifier town this]$_b$ [narrow very]$_c$

The phrase order a b c is reorderable to b a c (In this town, the streets are very narrow). A Chinese parallel might be glossed with topic [this classifier city /te^0/ street] before comment [very narrow], or, alternatively, with comment including embedded subject [street very narrow], after pause and after topic As for this city ... However, when functioning as modifier before /te^0/ in the topic, the modifier (This classifier city) precedes modified (street), just as the modifier (very) precedes modified (narrow) in the comment. In Thai, however, the modifier (very) follows the modified (narrow) in bracket c. So also in bracket b, the modifier (this) follows the modified (mɨaŋ which functions as $\frac{M}{m}$ for town and as $\frac{m}{M}$ for classifier of town; as shown below, many nouns may function as their own classifier).

He likes cleanliness.

(2) k'ăw c'ɔ̂·p k'uām sàà·t

[he] [like] [-ness clean]

Both Thai and Chinese favor this order (subject - verb - object), but the object would probably be uttered first, as topic, in parallel Chinese sentences, followed by comment (with embedded actor): As for cleanliness,

he likes, or perhaps more naturally, As for disorderliness, he doesn't like. In the Chinese parallel there are two compounds; cleanliness may be glossed (dry-quiet), and like is glossed (joy-delight). The final phrase in Thai sentence (2) begins with a morpheme glossed by the English suffix -ness from cleanliness. Here k'uām precedes an adjective or adjectival verb for clean, to be clean. When preceding the adjective for stupid, the phrase translation is stupidity; before pretty the translation is beauty; before rich the translation is wealth, and so on. But k'uām is found not only in phrases before adjectives; it appears also in phrases before many stative verbs, as to examine, with phrase translation examination, and to dress, with phrase translation apparel; and also before nouns, as doctor, with phrase translation medicine. Though incompatible with walk, run and verbs of action generally, k'uām appears before the verb to dance, with phrase translation dancing, as in the sentence: Dancing is good exercise. The bracket phrases in Thai can be glossed [-ing dance] [is] [method out energy-body that good], while bracket phrases for a parallel sentence in Chinese might be glossed [dance] [is] [one classifier good /te^{0}/ exercise]. Whether glossed -ness or -ing or abstraction, the Thai morpheme (k'uām) is followed by a modifier (dance) in the first phrase of the sentence; so also in the last phrase, the modifiers follow the modified. In Chinese a modifier string (one classifier good) is closed by /te^{0}/ before the modified (exercise). But /te^{0}/ has many functions in Chinese, while Thai /k'uām/ is much more restricted in function.

He walked over here to study the book.

(3) k'ǎw də̂·n mā· riān nǎŋ sɨ̌·

[he] [walk hitherward] [study] [book]

He came to this school.

(4) k'ǎw mā· rō·ŋ riān ní

[he] [come (place study) this]

Verb complements that function as directionals follow the verb, both in Thai and in Chinese, and are classified as minor morphemes ($\frac{m}{M}$) when functioning as verb complements in a phrase, as in Thai sentence (3) — mā· hitherward, but as major morphemes ($\frac{M}{m}$) when functioning as the verb nucleus of a phrase, as in Thai sentence (4) — mā· come. Compare also riān in compound for school (place study) in sentence (4) and out of compound as verb to study in sentence (3).

The dog bit him.

(5) sùnák kàt k'ǎw

$[\text{dog}]_a$ $[\text{bite}]_b$ $[\text{him}]_c$

The order (subject-verb-object) and the function marked by order — i.e. the same morpheme functioning as subject (k'ǎw glossed as he in 2, 3, 4) before verb, but as object after verb (glossed as him, above) — holds for pronouns as well as nouns both in Thai and Chinese. Hence, reordering of sentences like (5) involves contrastive syntax — from a b c to c b a (he bit the dog). Unnatural in Thai but common in Chinese is a reordering to c a b in non-contrastive syntax, with topic functioning as object (as for him) before com-

ment with embedded subject (dog bit).

He's bitten by the dog.

(6) k'ǎw tù·k sùnák kàt

[he] [by dog bite]

He is right.

(7) k'ǎw tù·k

[he] [correct]

Sentence (6) has parallels in 'acquired Mandarin' sentences (56) and (57); parallel also is the minor morpheme function of the passive transformative morpheme. The Thai comment in sentence (6) begins with tù·k by ($\frac{m}{M}$), but in sentence (7) the same morpheme functions as an adjectival verb ($\frac{M}{m}$).

He can do it.

(8) k'ǎw t'ām dâ·y

[he] [do can]

The verb nucleus for do in the comment phrase is a major morpheme (M) which precedes either dâ·y (potential can), as cited, or else pen (resultative can — as a result of knowing how); either of these function as minor morphemes ($\frac{m}{M}$) in (8), but dâ·y functions as major morpheme ($\frac{M}{m}$) in sentence (9). A parallel distinction between a potential or allowed can and can as a consequence of knowing how is structured differently in Mandarin Chinese — by nucleus verb (M) for He can (potentially) do it (t'a^{1} cuo^{4} te^{0}) and by the same nucleus verb in a phrase after a morpheme for can by knowing how ($\frac{m}{M}$), for He can (by knowing how) do it (t'a^{1} huei^{4} cuo^{4}).

He got many presents.

(9) k'ǎw dâ·y k'ɔ̌·ŋ k'uǎn yáe

[he] [receive] [(thing spirit) much]

Compare dâ·y functioning as a minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$, potential can) in (8), and in (9) the same dâ·y functioning as the verb nucleus ($\frac{M}{m}$, receive). In the object phrase, the modifier for much follows the modified, a compound for presents. Other modifiers encountered which follow the modified are those for very (after adjectival verb) in (1), for clean (after abstract noun) in (2), for this (after compound noun for school) in (4). Where the Chinese order would be consistently modifier-modified, the Thai order is consistently modified-modifier. In the following Thai sentences the modified appears before the modifier (or string of modifiers) in the comment phrase bracket, which may serve as adjectival verb after the topic, functioning as subject:

He's good (k'ōn dī· [man good]);

He's important (k'ōn yày [man big]);

That's a big house (bâ·n yày [house big]);

That's an unripe banana (klûay dìp [banana unripe]).

But when the same noun (as for banana) is topic as subject before adjectival verb functioning as comment in the following phrase bracket, the Thai order is not different from Chinese parallels:

The banana is unripe (klûay dìp [banana] [unripe]);

The banana is not ripe (klûay mây? sùk [banana] [not ripe]).

Morphemes functioning as adverbs, like other Thai modifiers in general,

follow the modified — the verbs in the same phrase bracket (dɔ̄·n rēw [walk quick], p'û·t dā·ŋ mâ·k [speak loud very]), unlike Chinese; but like Chinese, Thai directionals, functioning as minor morphemes ($\frac{m}{M}$), follow the verb nucleus (M or $\frac{M}{m}$) in the same phrase bracket, as shown in sentence (3) above. Compare the nucleus verb for walk in He is walking here, which is preceded by a morpheme functioning as progressive ($\frac{m}{M}$) and followed by a directional ($\frac{m}{M}$):

(10) k'ǎw kāmlāŋ dɔ̄·n mā·

[he] [progressive walk hitherward]

As in Chinese, more than one directional may follow the nucleus verb of the Thai phrase, as in sentence (11), below.

In noun phrases with localizers, however, the Thai localizer morpheme precedes the nucleus noun, whereas the Chinese localizers, like the directionals proper, follow the noun, sometimes after a co-verb introducing the noun direction phrase (cai to be at). Compare Thai sentence (1), above, with Thai for

He's running into the house.

(11) k'ǎw wîŋ k'âw pāy nāy bâ·n

$[\text{he}]_a$ $[\text{run into thither}]_b$ $[\text{inside house}]_c$

In phrase b, the two morphemes which follow the verb nucleus for run function as directionals ($\frac{m}{M}$); when functioning as a verb nucleus ($\frac{M}{m}$), k'âw is glossed enter, and pāy is glossed go. In phrase c, the morpheme which precedes the noun nucleus for house functions as a localizer ($\frac{m}{M}$). In this sentence the

topic, a, is followed by the comment, b and c. But the phrase for [inside house] functions as topic in the sentence There are people in the house.

(12) nāy bâ·n mī· k'ōn

[inside house] [has] [man]

Compare He lives in the house, with verb nucleus yù· glossed live ($\frac{M}{m}$),

(13) k'ǎw yù· nāy bâ·n

[he] [live] [inside house]

and He sits on the table, with the morpheme yù· glossed in position as a directional ($\frac{m}{M}$) after the nucleus verb for sit,

(14) k'ǎw nâŋ yù· bɔ̄n tó

[he] [sit in position] [on table]

The localizer in noun phrases, as nāy inside, bɔ̄n on, tâ·y under (as in tâ·y kâwî· under the chair), lâ·ŋ underneath, the level below, kâ·ŋ side (as in [side right] for the right side), precedes the noun in Thai, when not functioning as classifier. One morpheme, kâ·ŋ functions both as localizer (glossed side), preceding nouns, and as classifier (glossed member of a pair), following nouns.

In Thai noun phrases including classifier, the morpheme sequence begins with noun (sequence initial). In Chinese, the parallel string ends with noun (sequence final). Both Thai and Chinese include the same 'parts of speech' in the maximum sequence and of these 'parts of speech' two are in the same relative order ('numeral' before 'classifier'); the other 'parts of speech' are in inverse or opposite orders:

'demonstrative' in classifier string final in Thai, but in string initial in Chinese; 'adjective' immediately after the string initial 'noun' in Thai, but immediately before the string final 'noun' in Chinese;
'numeral' - 'classifier' (in that order) between 'noun' ± 'adjective' and 'demonstrative' in Thai, but between 'demonstrative' and the 'adjective'-'noun' sequence in Chinese.

In Thai the classifier sequence for singular is 'noun'-'classifier'; for plural it is 'noun'-'numeral'-'classifier', with the numeral marking more than one. This singular vs. plural distinction is not affected by the addition to the sequence of post-nominal 'adjective' or of post-classifier 'demonstrative' (or interrogative or adjectival verb functioning as 'demonstrative').

For example, that book (singular) in classifier phrase without numeral is

năŋsɨ̌· lêˑm nán

[book classifier that].

The following classifier phrases mark plural by including 'numeral' before 'classifier'. The 'numeral'-'classifier' sequence may then be preceded by 'adjective' or followed by 'demonstrative'. In the phrases for two horses and eight oranges which follow, the classifier appropriate for the noun horses (and other nouns) is different from the noun, and also different from the classifier appropriate for the noun oranges (and other nouns):

máˑ sɔ̌ˑŋ tuā

[horse two classifier]

sôm pæ̀ˑt lûˑk

[orange eight classifier].

But in the phrase for three men the classifier appropriate for the noun man is identical in shape with the noun for man:

k'ōn sā·m k'ōn

[man three classifier]

There are many morphemes in Thai like k'ōn which function as classifiers (minor morphemes, $\frac{m}{M}$), but uniquely so, since they are appropriate only for the same morpheme functioning as noun (major morpheme, $\frac{M}{m}$), when it is the nucleus morpheme of the phrase.

In those instances — numerous in Thai — in which the noun morpheme is the same as its unique classifier, the single morpheme as topic functioning as subject might be taken as the noun itself or else as the classifier. When both noun and classifier are included in the topic phrase, the ambiguity does not arise, e.g., in the sentence This card is very pretty, glossed [card classifier this] [pretty much]. But the ambiguity might arise in the Thai sentence for This is very pretty, glossed [classifier this] [pretty much], since the modifier follows the modified, whether classifier or noun.

Compare with the above, the Thai sentence for Every card is pretty, glossed [card (every every) classifier] [also pretty]. Since both noun and classifier are included in the topic, there can be no confusion as to which is noun and which is classifier even were the two the same morpheme functioning differently: the classifier follows the reduplicated (every every). Hence, there is also no ambiguity in the Thai sentence for Every one is pretty, glossed [(every every) classifier] [also pretty], since here again a classifier (rather than a noun) would follow (every every). In both of these Thai

sentences, the comment includes the morpheme for also (kɜ̂ʔ) and does not include after that for pretty the modifier for very, which is incompatible with (every every) in the topic. Parallel sentences in Chinese for Every card is pretty and Every one is pretty mark every redundantly: by reduplication of the classifier in the topic (whether or not the noun follows the reduplicated classifier) and by a morpheme glossed all in the comment.

Certain Thai nouns can be reduplicated, marking plural in a distributive sense; but even when a noun is not or cannot be reduplicated, it may be followed by a reduplicated modifier for (every every). Hence, the latter kind of reduplication can generate more sentences than reduplication of a restricted set of nouns. The general message for the productive reduplication in sentence (15) is the same as that for the less productive reduplication of noun in sentence (16), namely,

Every child must go to school.

(15) dèk t'úk t'úk k'ɔ̄n tɔ̂ŋ riān năŋsɤ̌.

[child (every every) classifier] [must study book]

(16) dèk dèk t'úk k'ɔ̄n tɔ̂ŋ riān năŋsɤ̌.

[(child child) every classifier] [must study book]

Fewer 'parts of speech' are commonly reduplicated in Thai than in Chinese. In both, reduplicated forms are more lively and vivid than unreduplicated forms, as in reduplicated compounds, which occur both in Thai and Chinese. Thus, what is glossed from Chinese as (horse + horse)-(tiger + tiger) is a reduplicated compound functioning as an adverb (in a slap-dash

manner). Compare the reduplication of the verb compound for (run - jump) in the Thai sentence for He is dancing energetically, glossed [he] [in process of (run ± run) -(jump ± jump)]. The reduplication of compounds is not as productive in Thai as in the following Chinese sentence which may be translated Besides eating and drinking every day, he doesn't do anything, and glossed in phrases as [he] [every day] [subtract (eat eat) (drink drink) besides] [then not do] [other].

Formal elaboration in Thai reduplication makes it possible to set up a fundamental distinction between plain reduplication and initial echo reduplication. Plain reduplication may be somewhat less common in Thai than in Chinese, while echo reduplication is very common in Thai, and almost absent in Chinese.

In Thai, plain reduplication involves the repetition of a morpheme without tone change, as in the sentence

He speaks somewhat slowly.

(17) k'ăw p'ûːt c'áː c'áː

[he] [speak (slow slow)]

Here the modifier is reduplicated for moderate emphasis (somewhat slowly) in respect to the preceding modified verb (speak).

But where the repeated morphemes are not quite the same, either because there is tone change or because there is change in vowel (± change in tone), the initial morpheme in reduplication echoes the second (repeats, but with alteration of some sort): hence, initial echo reduplication. The kind of

echo reduplication with tone change appears in the sentence

There are very many people.

(18) mī· k'ōn má·k mâ·k

[have] [man (very-much much)]

Here the modifier is reduplicated for emphasis but with tone change for great or greater emphasis, (very-much much) in respect to the preceding modified noun (man).

Other instances of reduplication with tone change for modifier after modified are sàá·t sàà·t for (very-clean clean) in sentence (19), which is more emphatic than sàà·t mâ·k (clean very) in sentence (20). Compare the merely descriptive dī· good in sentence (21) with the mildly emphatic dī· dī· for good job in sentence (22), with the very emphatic modifier dī́· dī· for really well in sentence (23). Echo reduplication is the initial reduplication kind, with change in tone occurring on the first of the repeated morphemes.

He dresses (decorates body) very neatly.

(19) k'ăw tæ̀ŋ tuā sàá·t sàà·t

[he] [(decorate body) (very-clean clean)]

(20) k'ăw tæ̀ŋ tuā sàà·t mâ·k

[he] [(decorate body) clean very]

He dances well.

(21) k'ăw tên dī·

[he] [jump good]

Do a good job on the dance (dance well).

(22) tə̂n dī· dī·

[jump (good good)]

He dances really well.

(23) k'ă̂w tə̂n dí· dī·

[he] [jump (very-good good)]

In echo reduplication change in vowel may occur without change in tone (lə́lə́ t'ə́ t'ə́ oh, how messy reduplicated from the adjectival verb lə́ t'é messy), or with change in tone, for (really-money money) in

He doesn't have any money, really.

(24) k'ă̂w mâ̂y mī· sàtû̂ŋ sàtāŋ rə̌·k

[he] [not have] [(really-money money)] that's it

Minimum contrasting pairs of sentences occur, one with plain reduplication, the other with echo reduplication (tone change ± vowel change, including lengthening of vowel), as in He's rather thin glossed [he] [(thin thin)] vs. He's really thin glossed [he] [(really-thin thin)]. Contrasting pairs of sentences also occur with adjectival verbs (e.g. the compound for happy (good heart)) followed by modifier, as in I'm very happy glossed [I] [(good heart) very], and with echo-reduplication of the compound, as in I'm really happy, glossed [I] [(good real-heart) (good heart)].

In Thai the sentence for This is my world might be glossed either [world this] [be of I], or, less naturally (but more parallel to the 'acquired Mandarin' and Peking Mandarin order), [this] [be] [world of I]. In Mandarin my world is glossed [I of world]. The Mandarin morpheme glossed of or

possessor (written 's) is te^0, and appears in many other contexts (e.g. after adjective or adjective phrases as an adverbializer before verbs) while the Thai morpheme glossed of is a minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$), k'ɔ̄·ŋ, after the modified and before the modifier. Both function as a link between modified and modifier, as in Thai, or between modifier and modified, as in Mandarin where, however, the linking morpheme is generally obligatory rather than optional. For soldier's clothing, the Thai phrase might be glossed [clothing of soldier] or else [clothing soldier], without k'ɔ̄·ŋ to link the two; but in Chinese the linking morpheme would necessarily appear between the modifier and the modified: [soldier's clothing]. To omit the Mandarin te^0 for apostrophe 's might seem like an attempt to innovate a compound. Compounds are numerous and complex in Chinese, but relatively infrequent in Thai.

Examples of Thai compounds are found in sentences (4), (9), (19), and (20), above. In addition the Thai compound for ruined is lĕ·w læ̀·k (soggy broken); for pen pà·k kā· (mouth crow); for fruit p'ōnla mâ·y (result wood). There appears to be no ambiguity in Thai between a modified modifier phrase and a compound. Some compounds of the head-attribute type, as man-garden for gardener are formally parallel to sequences of modified-modifier morphemes in one phrase, as in the first phrase of sentence (24b).

The gardener beat the dog.

(24b) k'ōn suăn tī· sùnák

[(man garden)] [beat] [dog]

The Thai sentence for He's very thin, glossed [he] [thin much], offers

selection of two different morphemes for the topic [he]. One morpheme is used normally for persons (man or woman speaking), the other for animals; but the latter may be used in a derogatory sense. Pronouns used for persons include: c'ăn first person singular, t'ə̄· second person singular or plural, k'ăw third person singular or plural, rāw first person plural, t'ə̂n polite second or third person, k'ūn polite second person (or Mr. or Miss before personal names). In many conversations, however, these pronouns are conspicuous by their absence, and instead, reference to all persons is made by the use of personal names, kinship terms, titles, and the like. The use of pronouns permits specification of plural by p'uak in the order plural marker before pronoun — before any pronoun except c'ăn and k'ūn.

The comment phrase for the sentence He's very thin was glossed [thin much] with the modifier following the modified. In the sentence There are many flowers, glossed [flower] [much], the same morpheme that served as modifier in the two-morpheme comment now appears in a one word comment, [much], with predicative rather than modifier function.

As major morpheme, kāmlāŋ is glossed energy, force. But when appearing in a verb phrase before the nucleus, as [he] [kāmlāŋ sleep], explicit progressive aspect is marked: He is sleeping. A less explicit way of marking the progressive for He is sleeping is shown in the gloss [he] [sleep at]. Here at functions as $\frac{m}{M}$; when $\frac{M}{m}$ the same morpheme is glossed to be, or to be at. The progressive for He is sleeping may be marked redundantly, by both devices, as shown in [he] [kāmlāŋ sleep at].

In a Thai phrase, the morpheme, k'ɔ̄·ŋ, glossed <u>of</u>, is optional. When it is found in the phrase [modified-<u>of</u>-modifier], k'ɔ̄·ŋ functions as a link morpheme which is minor $\frac{m}{M}$. But alternatively, in other phrases, when k'ɔ̄·ŋ functions as a major morpheme, $\frac{M}{m}$, it is glossed as <u>thing</u>. Though there is also a morpheme that is glossed <u>of</u> in 'acquired Mandarin', the Chinese use of this morpheme (te^0) is generally obligatory, and in the sequence [modifier-<u>of</u>-modified] which differs from the partly parallel Thai order. Furthermore, the Chinese morpheme te^0, for <u>of</u>, always functions as <u>m</u>, as a minor morpheme, while the Thai morpheme k'ɔ̄·ŋ, alternates between $\frac{m}{M}$ and $\frac{M}{m}$, according to its function in different phrases — glossed as <u>of</u> ($\frac{m}{M}$), or as <u>thing</u> ($\frac{M}{m}$). Of these two morphemes, te^0 appears in many Chinese sentences whose equivalent does not call for k'ɔ̄·ŋ in Thai. Compare the gloss phrasing of the sentence <u>He walks slowly</u>: [<u>he</u>] [(<u>slow slow</u>) te^0] [<u>walk</u>] in Chinese; but, without k'ɔ̄·ŋ, [<u>he</u>] [<u>walk</u> (<u>slow slow</u>)] in Thai. So also in the following Thai sentence.

<u>There are few people who are wealthy</u>.

(25) k'ōn ruāŋ ruāŋ mī· nó·y

[<u>man</u> (<u>rich rich</u>)] [<u>have few</u>]

The reduplication is optional.

In sentence (26), below, the free translation gives an optional actor (either <u>he</u> or <u>you</u>); but as is shown in the literal gloss, Thai does not include any morpheme for specifying the actor unless zero morpheme for actor is postulated for the sake of explanation. The referent of the zero morpheme

is non-first person; that is to say, the referent is either the person addressed (if a man), or irrespective of sex, a third person; the referent is never the speaker, never first person. The two phrases of sentence (26) before the pause, [thing (good good)] [not like] //, might be translated as a self-sufficient sentence, As for good things, zero actor (anyone except first person) does not like. This is parallel to a sentence in our sample of 'acquired Mandarin', except for the different referent of the zero actor in Chinese: As for chicken, zero actor (first person, the speaker) does not want to eat any more.

He doesn't (or you don't) like good things, but only bad ones.

(26) k'ɔ̌·ŋ dī· dī· mây c'ɔ̂·p // c'ɔ̂·p tæ· k'ɔ̌·ŋ siă̌

[thing (good good)] [not like] [like only] [thing bad]

In the first clause (before pause //), the object phrase [thing (good good)] precedes verb phrase [not like], and though the modifier (good good) is reduplicated, it may optionally be unreduplicated (good). In the second clause (after pause //), the object phrase [thing bad] follows the verb phrase [like only], and the modifier is unreduplicated (bad), without optional possibility of reduplication — never (bad bad).

In the preceding sentence, k'ɔ̌·ŋ appears twice, as the first morpheme of the initial phrase [thing (good good)], and of the final phrase [thing bad]. In each occurrence k'ɔ̌·ŋ functions as a major morpheme ($\frac{M}{m}$) rather than as a minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$) or as a link that is glossed of between modified and modifier (see above). Such link morphemes as k'ɔ̌·ŋ in Thai and te^0 in Chinese are fewer in inventory count than final particle morphemes whose dependence

range extends over the entire comment. In order to show that the dependence range may extend over more than one phrase in the comment, the final particles are not enclosed within the brackets of any one phrase. Both in Chinese and in Thai such final particles always function as m, as minor morphemes which do not alternate with major morpheme function. The fact that such final particles are always out of bracket — that is, not in any particular phrase — precludes changing the environment within the bracket that accounts for the alternating major-minor functions of other morphemes that do occur in brackets.

The list of final particles, always functioning as minor morphemes, is much longer in Thai than in Chinese. The great number of distinctions among Thai final particles is due to the fact that they are often selected to express degree of politeness — but not always. The final particles used irrespective of politeness may appear at the end of a sentence, or before another final particle which marks degree of politeness. The following occur in sentence final or pre-final, and have a general interrogative function:

mǎy, after comment clause of declarative sentence, but incompatible with clauses which specify not (mây-), already (lɛ́·w), in process of (kāmlāŋ); the declarative sentence is transformed into an interrogative sentence by the addition of mǎy.

Are you going?

(27) k'ūn pāy mǎy k'ráp

[you] [go] interrogative polite, man speaking

This question is possible with other selection of the final polite particle; and it may end in mǎy. Sentence (27) may be answered by a sentence which includes any appropriate polite final particle — or none at all. But the answer must include the morpheme glossed [go], for the affirmative; and mây pāy [not go] for the negative.

I'm going.

(28) pāy k'ráp

[go] polite, man speaking

(29) pāy k'à

[go] polite, woman speaking

r$\overset{y}{\text{+}}$· transforms any declarative sentence into a question of a yes-or-no type.

You are going?

(30) k'ūn pāy r$\overset{y}{\text{+}}$· k'ráp

[you] [go] interrogative polite, man speaking

Yes.

(31) k'ráp

polite, man speaking

(32) k'à

polite, woman speaking

Yes, I'm going.

(28), (29) — see above.

No.

(33) plà·w k'ráp

[do not] polite, man speaking

I'm not going.

(34) mây pāy k'ráp

[not go] polite, not going

Unlike mǎy, rɨ́· may occur in negative sentences which are interrogative. Such negative questions call for different response sentences than do positive questions: after question sentence (35), the positive response may begin with denying the assertion of the question, as in sentence (36). Or the positive response may be the same as sentence (28) or (29).

You are not going?

(35) k'ūn mây pāy rɨ́· k'ráp

[you] [not go] interrogative polite, man speaking

No, I'm going.

(36) plà·w k'ráp // p'ǒm pāy

[not so] polite, man speaking [I] [go]

After question sentence (35), above, the negative response may state agreement with the negative part of the question, without repeating the verb of the question as in sentence (37). Alternatively, after question sentence (35), above, the negative response may begin with agreeing politely to the negative part of the question, and then repeat the negative assertion, as in sentence (38).

You're right (i.e. I'm not going).

(37) c'ây k'ráp

[correct, man speaking] polite, man speaking

Yes, I'm not going.

(38) k'ráp // p'ŏm mây pāy

polite, man speaking [I] [not go]

Paired prefinal particles may appear before optional polite particle in question sentences which ask whether something has been done, as in question sentences (39), (40), and (41).

Have you eaten rice?

(39) k'ūn t'ā·n k'â·w rɨ̌· yāŋ k'ráp

[you] [eat rice] interrogative not yet polite, man speaking

(40) k'ūn t'ā·n k'â·w lǽ·w rɨ̌· k'ráp

[you] [eat rice] already interrogative polite, man speaking

Did you eat rice?

(41) k'ūn t'ā·n k'â·w rɨ̌· plà·w

[you] [eat rice] interrogative not so

The positive answer to (39) and (40) question sentences repeats the verb of the question as well as one of the paired prefinal particles, and may repeat the final polite particle, as in answer sentence (42). The positive answer to question sentence (41) repeats neither of the paired particles, but does repeat the verb of the question, as in answer sentence (43).

I've eaten.

(42) t'ā·n lǽ·w k'ráp

[eat] already polite, man speaking

I did eat.

(43) t'ā·n k'ráp

[eat] polite, man speaking

The negative answer to question sentences (39) and (40) is given below in answer sentence (44). The negative answer to question (41) is given in answer sentence (45), below. These negative answers do not repeat the verb of the question, but do include one of the prefinal particles.

Not yet.

(44) yāŋ k'ráp

not yet polite, man speaking

I didn't.

(45) plà·w k'ráp

not so polite, man speaking

The particle ná, after a comment clause, is used in question sentences which do not require an answer; such sentences ask what is assumed to be true, what is urged by the speaker, what is suggested to the person spoken to who is supposed to be in agreement with the speaker, as in question sentences (46) and (47).

You'll come, won't you?

(46) k'ūn tʂŋ mā· ná

[you] [must come] agreed?

He 's nice, isn't he?

(47) k'ă̆w dī· ná

[he] [good] agreed?

The particle, rɔ̀k, after a comment clause, is used in sentences which are supposed to state what is obvious or what is taken for granted. Such sentences as (48) and (49), do not question the preceding comment but rather assert that it is self-evident.

He surely won't come.

(48) k'ă̆w k'ōŋ mâ̂y mā· rɔ̀k

[he] [probably not come] obviously

Don't do it; it's not good, you know.

(49) yà· t'ām mān lɔ̄·y // mâ̂y dī· rɔ̀k

[negative imperative do it at all] [not good] obviously

Sentence (49), above, is divided into two parts or clauses (separated by a pause, //); each part or clause may be uttered as an independent sentence. In sentences (30), (35), (39), (40), and (41), above, the interrogative particle, rɛ̆·, appears after the last comment; in sentence (50), below, the interrogative particle, rɛ́·, appears after the first comment, and is followed by another comment. There is no pause, however, when rɛ́· appears in inter-clause position. The positive answer to question sentence (50) is given in sentence (51); the negative answer is given in sentence (52).

Will you go or won't you?

(50) t'ə̄· cà pāy rɛ́ mâ̂y pāy

[you] [will go] alternative interrogative [not go]

I'm going.

(51) pāy

[go]

I'm not going.

(52) mây pāy

[not go]

The alternative interrogative particle, rɤ́, also appears between choices of object specified in such sentence questions as Will you have tea or coffee? The phrases of this sentence are glossed [you] [will take tea] alternative interrogative [coffee]. One minimum answer is [tea]; another is [coffee].

The either-or objects or subjects of a verb in a non-interrogative sentence are separated by the particle, kɔ̂, glossed then, as in either he or I,

(53) mây k'áw ' kɔ́ c'án

[not he] then [I]

In a series of three choices, the first pair of choices is separated from the final choice by a sequence of three morphemes, as for either a dog or a cat or else a cow,

(54) mă· mǣ·w rɤ́· mây kɔ̂ wuā

[dog cat] alternative interrogative not then [cow]

Of other final particles not specifying degree of politeness, là? that's the situation is used in sentences parallel to sentences in our sample of 'acquired Mandarin' with final particle le^{0}, also glossed that's the situation, as in the Thai sentence for Look, it's raining already, glossed [(rain descend) already]

là? that's the situation; and for It seems that he's already eaten the noodles, glossed [he] [eat noodle already] là? that's the situation; and for The guest has arrived (!) glossed [guest] [come already] là? that's the situation.

There are final particles in a higher degree of politeness than those exemplified above in sentences (27) ff. — namely, those used in addressing the king. In non-royal inter-personal relationships, women may politely end question sentences with k'á, and end other sentences with k'à, while men may politely end all sentences with k'ráp, as exemplified, (27) ff. In less elevated, less polite, or even condescending conversations, women may end question sentences, as (55), with cá, and other sentences, as (56), with cà; the parallel final particles, at this degree of politeness, are question sentence final há, and other sentence final hà, for a man or very young woman speaking.

Do you understand it?

(55) t'ə· k'âw cay mǎy cá

[you] [(enter heart)] interrogative less polite, woman speaking

I can't explain it.

(56) c'ǎn àt'ibā·y mây pēn cà

[I] [explain not able] less polite, woman speaking

In non-royal inter-personal relationships, a response sentence is more apt to include a polite particle if the preceding stimulus sentence ended in a polite particle. Some younger Thai speakers use polite particles only in addressing an older person, or persons of the same age but opposite sex, or persons higher

in social rank; one young woman, for example, never uses polite particles in speaking to her male siblings nor to her peers of the same age, rank, and sex.

Degree of politeness is expressed in selection of some other words, besides final particles. Pronouns, as shown above, distinguish polite second and third person from ordinary second and third persons. There is in Thai, as in Chinese, some ambiguity in the As for chicken, zero person doesn't want to eat any (more), if the common Thai morpheme, kin eat, is used; then the phrases of this sentence — [chicken] [not hungry for eat already] that's the situation — might suggest, for example, that a pregnant woman was not hungry for or longing for chicken (especially since Thai pregnant women long for sour things or for food difficult to obtain), on the one hand, or that it was the chicken that did not wish to eat any more. But if the polite morpheme, t'ā·n, for eat, is used in the same sentence, chickens are excluded as possible eaters. The ordinary morpheme for eat is appropriate, whether chickens or humans are the eaters. But then the Thai talk about humans eating in this way only in the company of good friends, among members of the family, and in addressing dogs or humans of inferior social rank. Other morphemes are used as polite introducers when functioning as minor morphemes, as garunaa, glossed as please below (but this same morpheme is glossed as be kind when it functions as a major morpheme): Please invite him to come again, which may be phrased in two different ways, [please invite him] [let come again] or [please invite] [let him come again].

The three syllable morpheme for please, garunaa, is a Sanskrit borrowing

in Thai; Gedney says Thai has as many words derived from Sanskrit as English has Latin borrowings. The Sanskrit words introduced into Thai give Thai texts the appearance of having many long words; without the Sanskrit contribution, Thai morphemes appear to be mostly monosyllabic, like Chinese morphemes. But the Thai monosyllables, unlike those in Chinese, show a length distinction (long vs. short) for all vowels. In addition to a general Chinese and Thai distinction in stop consonants (aspirated versus non-aspirated), Thai makes an additional distinction (voicing) for some but not all stops. Typologically, Thai is quite symmetrical in its sound contrasts, both in its vowel system and consonant system, where Chinese is not. In short, the phonologies of the two languages are typologically dissimilar.

So also in the rest of the two grammars, similarities and differences have already been noted (see above). Alternation of tone of a given morpheme may alter the meaning in Thai (as in echo reduplication), but not in Chinese, where alternation of tone is merely phonological. Some features of similarity between the two may mask a difference in density of occurrence — e.g. much compounding in Chinese, but relatively little in Thai, also much reduplication in Chinese, but possibly even more reduplication in Thai. Conversely, some features of apparent difference between the two may be reduced to an isomorphic sameness, as modifier-modified order in Chinese and modified-modifier order in Thai. From the syntax of the two languages, it appears that they share a common typological orientation.

The remaining sentences — (57) to (71) — exemplify again what is, in

both Chinese and Thai (and also in other languages in Southeast Asia), most persistent in syntax, and most pervasive — hence, exemplified in every sample of sentences, including the preceding sample — namely, the change in function or 'parts of speech' category of a given morpheme, depending on its position in the phrase. This transformation effects not only 'parts of speech', but also one of the fundamental classes of morphemes, minor morphemes alternating with major morphemes.

Sentence (57), below, shows dī· functioning as verb (is good); in sentence (58) dī· functions as modifier (good) after noun phrase nucleus; in sentence (59) dī· functions as modifier (well) after verb phrase nucleus.

He is good.

(57) k'áw dī·

[he] [good]

He's a good man.

(58) k'áw pēn k'ōn dī·

[he] [be] [man good]

He studies well.

(59) k'áw riān dī·

[he] [study good]

The paired morphemes, k'ɔ̄·ŋ k'áw for his, function as modifier after noun phrase nucleus in the topic of sentence (60); in sentence (61) the paired morphemes are the topic, without prior modified morpheme; they also appear in the second comment phrase in sentence (62); as in sentence (60), above,

they function as modifier in sentences (63) and (64). But in sentence (64), the preceding noun phrase nucleus is the same morpheme as the first of the paired morphemes for his, which functions as a minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$, glossed of), while the modified k'ɔ̌·ŋ functions as a major morpheme ($\frac{M}{m}$, glossed thing). So also in sentence (65).

His book is red.

(60) náŋsɨ̌· k'ɔ̌·ŋ k'áw sɨ̌· dǣ·ŋ

[book of he] [(color red)]

His is red.

(61) k'ɔ̌·ŋ k'áw sɨ̌· dǣ·ŋ

[of he] [(color red)]

The red book is his.

(62) náŋsɨ̌· sɨ̌· dǣ·ŋ pēn k'ɔ̌·ŋ k'áw

[book (color red)] [be] [of he]

His younger sibling came.

(63) nɔ̂·ŋ k'ɔ̌·ŋ k'áw mā·

[younger sibling of he] [come]

His things are lost.

(64) k'ɔ̌·ŋ k'ɔ̌·ŋ k'áw hă̄·y

[thing of he] [lose]

He has many things.

(65) k'áw mī· k'ɔ̌·ŋ yǽ·

[he] [have] [thing many]

In sentence (66), the morpheme dâ·y functions as a major morpheme ($\frac{M}{m}$, glossed get); in sentence (67), it functions as a preceding verb complement minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$, glossed past tense). Compare sentence (8), above, where dâ·y functions as potential — i.e. as a following verb complement minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$, glossed can).

He got two new shirts.

(66) k'áw dâ·y s̄a mày sɔ̄·ŋ tuā

[he] [get] [clothes new two classifier]

He received a letter from a friend.

(67) k'ǎw dâ·y ráp còk mǎ·y cà·k p'̄an

[he] [past tense receive] [(record meaning)] [from friend]

In sentences (68) and (69) the morpheme pāy functions as a major morpheme ($\frac{M}{m}$, glossed go); in sentences (70) and (71), it functions as a directional verb complement minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$, glossed away).

He will go.

(68) k'áw pāy

[he] [go]

He went to visit his friend.

(69) k'áw pāy hǎ· p'̄ân

[he] [go] [find] [friend]

He walked away.

(70) k'áw dō·n pāy

[he] [walk away]

He walked off to visit his friend.

(71) k áw dō·n pāy hǎ· p'íân

[he] [walk away] [find] [friend]

2.2. In their wide geographic spread, the Kam-Thai languages are classified into three groups (2.0, above). Some phonological samenesses and differences of languages in these groups are now summarized. The language names given may in some cases not be different languages but, instead, turn out to be divergent dialects of one or another language, thereby reducing the number of separate Kam-Thai languages. Offsetting such possible reduction, is the equal possibility that there are still other, separate Kam-Thai languages which have not been recorded. Of those recorded,most information is concerned with the sound distinctions made in the languages of each major group. The evidence for this classification is based on vocabulary distribution (not counting the borrowings mentioned in 2.0), on phonological feature distribution, and on phonological developments peculiar to each group. The summary which follows is restricted to a discussion of the phonemic distinctions made in particular languages within each group.

I. The Southwestern group (or the Tai-Shan languages)

The letters for sounds used in writing the sample of Thai sentences (2.1, above) are supposed to be distinctive (phonemic), because they contrast at the beginning of a syllable (and sounds in this position are called 'initials') or at the end of a syllable (and sounds in this position are called 'finals'), or both initially and finally. Mary Haas and Heng Subhanka (1945) recognize essentially the same distinctions among sounds of the same Thai dialect; they sometimes use a different letter for a given sound, as /j/ instead of the /y/ used in our sample of Thai sentences; and they write/g/ for final, and do not write the glottal stops /ʔ/. The question here is not whether a given sound can be heard phonetically in Thai, but whether it is distinctive phonemically.

The consonant finals are:

p	t	k	(and possibly /ʔ/)
m	n	ŋ	
w	y		

The final /k/ is voiced, and might be written /g/ when final and /k/ when initial; or /k/ in both positions, with the rule that it is unvoiced as an initial, and voiced as a final. If this convention is followed, then it can be said that, though there are only seven or eight consonant finals, the consonant initials include these and about a dozen additional consonant distinctions—in fact, the whole inventory of Thai consonants.

The consonant initials are:

p	t	c	(affricate [ts] or [tš])	k	ʔ
p'	t'	c'		k'	(the apostrophe means that the stop is aspirated --i.e. followed by [h])
b	d				
m	n			ŋ	
w		y			
f		s			h
	r l				

All three nasals, both semivowels, and some of the stop initials also occur as finals; but all three fricatives and the two liquids occur only as initials.

In the Thai-English Students' Dictionary, Mary R. Haas (1964) writes the glottal stop (which she did not do in her 1945 collaboration with Heng Subhanka), and persists in writing both allophones of the velar stop (k- initially but -g finally). This permits her to give in one chart all the consonants in the Thai system, which now follows (those which occur only as

initials are followed by hyphen; the others may occur both as initials and as finals; superscript h is used instead of the traditional apostrophe after stops that are aspirated):

p-	t-	c-	k-	ʔ
p^h-	t^h-	c^h-	k^h-	
b	d		-g	
f-	s-			h-
m	n		ŋ	
	l-			
	r-			
w		y		

By using fewer letters, and more rules for the values of the letters that he does use, George Trager (1957) writes aspirated stops as a cluster of plain stops plus /h/, the affricate as a cluster of /t/ plus /y/, and so on.

The nine Thai vowels make very symmetrical contrasts at front (F), central (C) and back (B) tongue positions at each of three tongue heights (high, mid, low); in short, they represent a 3 (FCB) vowel type which is very widespread among Southeast Asian languages.

The vowel letters used for Thai are:

	F[ront]	C[entral]	B[ack]
high	i	ɨ	u
mid	e	ə	o
low	æ	a	ɔ

Each vowel letter is written singly when short, and with a raised dot after it when long. When written without tone diacritic (unmarked) or with macron (¯), the tone specified is middle tone. High tone is specified by diacritic /ˊ/

over the vowel; low tone by /ˋ/; rising tone by /ˇ/; and falling tone by /ˆ/.

The three vowel clusters have /a/ as the second vowel and a front, central, or back vowel at high tongue height as the first vowel--they are, accordingly, /ia/, /ɨa/, and /ua/. Consonant clusters of two consonants are also restricted as to which kind of consonant (as stop) occurs as the first consonant of the cluster and which kind of consonant (as liquid) occurs as the second consonant of the cluster. In addition, sequences of any vowel or of some consonants plus semivowel are stated as special clusters or as part of the syllable structure by J. A. Gillette (1955), and by Arthur S. Abramson (1962), Murray Fowler (1952).

Standard Thai of Bangkok is sometimes distinguished from Northern Thai, Northeastern Thai, Southern Thai, as by Foongfaung Krantrachue (1960). A dialect spoken in Southern Thailand near the east coast of the Malay Peninsula is described by R. A. Miller (1956); it differs only slightly from standard Thai. Perhaps the dialects will turn out to differ in their frequency or selection of phonemes and their combinations rather than in the phonemic inventory as such. In our sample of Thai sentences, all the vowels are found singly, except the high central /ɨ/, but this vowel is found in the cluster /ɨa/. Neither long /i•/ nor long /ɨ•/ are found in our sample of sentences, but all the other vowels are found long and short medially. Finally for long vowels, high /i• u•/ are found, but not /ɨ•/; mid /ə•/ is found, but not /e• o•/; low /æ• a•/ are found, but not /ɔ•/. All the consonant finals and consonant initials of the inventory as given occur in our sample of Thai sentences, but some more frequently than others; and only three consonant clusters appear initially in our sentence sample, /pl/, /kl/, and /kʰr/.

Lao, one of the other languages of the Southwestern group, differs from

the Thai inventory for consonants only in making an additional distinction among nasals—palatal /ñ/ in addition to labial, dental, and velar /m n ŋ/. Though G. Edward Roffe (1946) uses a couple of different letters for writing vowels, the vowel distinctions show the same 3 (FCB) contrasts that appear in standard Thai. The two may possibly be mutually intelligible—dialects of one language -- at least in the areas where they are adjacent.

In an earlier description of Lao, or Laotian, J. J. Hospitalier (1937) lists five Thai language names for Laos (Lau, Neua, Dam, Deng, Lu); and three 'Chinese' language names—apparently members of the Miao-Yao family (Ho, Yao, Meo) which we distinguish from Han Chinese languages and dialects. The consonant inventory of the Laotian, as given, adds palatal /ñ/ to the other nasals, as above for what was called 'Lao', and writes /v/, presumably for /w/. The same three high and the same three mid vowels are contrasted, but only /a/ appears as a low vowel. Possibly more clustering of vowels as well as of consonants is found in this 'Laotian' than in standard Thai.

Søren Egerod speaks of Shan as a Thai language spoken in the Shan States of Burma, where Burmese and Karen are also spoken; in the Shan States of Yunnan, where Chinese is also spoken; and in northwest Thailand, in the Mae Hong Son area, where Thai is also spoken.

The Shan dialect described differs from Thai in making an additional distinction in consonant finals, and thereby being wholly symmetrical:

b	d	g
m	n	ŋ
w	y	ʏ

The Shan consonant initials make the same distinctions that Thai does for unaspirated and aspirated stops, for nasals, for semivowels, and for liquids;

but Shan /h/ appears to be the only fricative, and the voiced-voiceless contrast in stops is not made for initials. The Shan vowel system, including its tones, is closely similar to Thai, with a neutral tone added for open syllables; a doubled /aa/ is added to the chart for the 3 (FCB) vowel type described above for Thai.

For Lü, spoken in the Sipsong Panna area of southern Yunnan, Fang-Kuei Li (BIPH 35, 1964) reports a consonant inventory which differs from that given for our sample of Thai sentences only by the addition of the fricative /x/ and the replacement of /r/ by a unit fricative phoneme /hr/ which occurs in alternation with /h/ only in literary and formal pronunciation. The final consonants are the same as those for our Thai sample, including the /ʔ/. Lü has a ten vowel system, as does Shan, with the always long /a/ distinguished from the always short /ă/ in quality as well as quantity, /ă/ being further back and higher than /a/. The non-phonemic length of other vowels is determined by the tone and the final consonant or juncture. Lü does not have the diphthongs mentioned above for Thai.

We give below part of Li's summary table of distinctions among the phonologies of some of the Group I languages, with slight modification of his labels. The / between letters for phonemes at the tops of columns is to be read 'contrasts with'; an x in a given row represents the existence of the contrast or feature in the language named at the beginning of the row; a - indicates the absence of the contrast or feature.

	pl, kl, etc.	r/h	kh/x	ph/f	Voc. length	ia, ïa, ua	Tones
Thai	x	x	-	x	x	x	5
Lao	-	-	-	x	x	x	6

	pl,kl, etc.	r/h	kh/x	ph/f	Voc. length	ia, ïa, ua	Tones
Tai Noir	-	-	-	x	?	x	5
Khün	-	x	-	x	x	-	6
Tai Blanc	-	-	x	x	-	-	6
Lü	-	-	x	x	-	-	6
Shan	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

II. THE CENTRAL GROUP

(or the Nung-Tho languages)

It is possible that Lungchow belongs in a dialect group with Nung; or, Lungchow may be quite a separate language from Nung. At any rate, both are included as members of the central group of Kam-Thai languages. The sample phonology for this group that is given here identifies the dialect in terms of the residence of two informants, a woman (P'ing Li) and a man (Wei-han Fong) who speak the Tai Dialect of Lungchow, a member of the family that includes Siamese, Shan, Tay Blanc (White Tai), Nung and Chuang, according to Fang-Kuei Li (1940), with Nung and Lungchow listed as coordinate with other separate Kam-Thai languages.

The consonants in Lungchow show more distinctions than those in Thai-Shan languages (group I). Among Lungchow oral continuants, there is a voiced-voiceless contrast between labial /f v/, lateral /ɬ l/, and retroflex palatal /š ž/, with laryngeal /h/ distinguished from the voiceless fricatives, /f ɬ š/. The remaining consonant distinctions in Lungchow are of the same number as in Thai of group I, but the affricate matches the fricative, and the aspirated affricate is found only in Mandarin Chinese loans; /b d/ have a slight laryngeal constriction, reminescent of the pre-glottalized or implosive stops found in some other Kam-Thai languages, and in many languages of the Mon-Khmer family.

In place of the 3 (FCB) vowel type, plus or minus length, of Kam-Thai

languages in group I, there are two co-existent vowel sub-systems in our Lungchow sample of group II. The short vowels are of the type (FB) over N over N, because the vowels make a front-back contrast (FB) at high tongue height, /i u/, but there is no front-back contrast, or neutralized contrast (N) at mid tongue height, /ə/, not at low tongue height /a/. The long vowels are of the type 2 (FCB) over N because the long vowels make front-central-back contrast at two tongue heights, high /i˙ ɨ˙ u˙/ and mid /e˙ ə˙ o˙/, but no, or neutralized contrast (N) at low tongue height, /a˙/. There are three more distinctions of tones in Lungchow than in Thai of group I, namely:

mid-level;

mid falling to low;

mid-low rising to mid-high;

mid falling to low, in syllable ending in glottal stop /ʔ/;

high level;

low level;

high level, in syllable ending in oral stop /p t k/;

mid falling to low, in syllable ending in oral stop.

III. THE NORTHERN GROUP

(or the Kam-Sui languages)

Fang-Kuei Li (1948) emphasizes the closeness of the Mak language (Ho-Hwa-Chi-Lyo) and Sui, both classified in the Northern group (III). The Fang Tsuen dialect is taken to represent Mak (Mo-Chia), which may be influenced by the speakers of another Kam-Thai language, Chungchia (Chung Chia), with whom the Mak of Fang Tsuen often intermarry. Chungchia, however, may not be one of the northern group III languages. Besides the glottal stop in Mak, it is possible to say that there are eight linear distinctions among plain stops

(unaspirated): /p t č (or retracted č) k/ plus palatalized /p^y t^y/ and rounded /$č^w$ k^w/. It is also possible to say that there are only four linear distinctions among oral stops in Mak, and that Mak differs here from Thai of group I chiefly in the use of four consonant clusters as initials /py ty čw kw/. Each of the eight linear oral stops (or the four single stops and the four consonant cluster initials) is distinguished from a matching aspirated stop; and all but one— all except the rounded affricate— is further distinguished by voicing. An additional series of contrasts is between four preglottalized and voiced stops, /ʔb ʔd ʔd^y ʔd^w/. There are even more linear distinctions in Mak among nasals than among plain or aspirated stops; the nine nasals (or nasal consonant beside nasal semi-vowel clusters) are /m m^y n n^y n^w ñ $ñ^w$ ŋ $ŋ^w$/. There is matching of voiceless and voiced fricatives, /f v, s ʐ, s^w $ʐ^w$, š / (with /ʐ $ʐ^w$/ heard as unrounded and rounded fricative [r] when medial or in fast speech), besides voiceless /h/. The plain lateral /l/ is distinguished from palatalized /l^y/, from rounded /l^w/, and from /w/, /y/ and /y^w/.

There are two coexisting vowel subsystems in Mak. The one for short vowels distinguishes front-back at high tongue height /i u/; and at mid tongue height, /ə o/; here /ə/ is more front than /o/ — a fronter vowel, though actually central; a neutral or no contrast vowel occurs at low tongue height, /a/. This 2 (FB) over N type for short vowels is less symmetrical than the 2 (FCB) type for long vowels: /i° ə° u°/ at high tongue height, and /e° a° o°/ at low tongue height. The tones of these vowels are affected by finals, whether stop (-p -t -k), or other final; and by stress. Six tones are commonly contrastive (low rising, mid falling, upper mid level, high falling, mid rising, lower mid rising or level), and a rarer seventh tone is usually heard only in words borrowed from Chinese (high level).

Sui is spoken with its own dialect variations called Sui-P'o, Sui Li, Sui Ai, San Tung, etc. The speakers of different Sui dialects still recognize each other as members of one tribe. This sense of tribal unity is not extended to include speakers of Mak. The dialect taken to represent Sui is that spoken in two villages, Ngam and Li, in Lipo County, in the southeast of Kweichow Province (Fang Kuei Li, 1948, 1949). This Sui dialect shows many similarities with the Mak. In addition to the plain series of nasals, the Sui nasals /m n ñ ŋ/ contrast with four matching pre-glottalized nasals, and with four matching voiceless nasals. The Sui voiced stops /b d/ contrast with two matching pre-glottalized stops, /ʔb ʔd/. Besides the glottal stop /ʔ/, the six linear distinctions among plain or unaspirated stops, / p c č k q/ are matched by six aspirated stops. Besides uvular fricative /R/ and laryngeal /h/, two of the four voiceless fricatives in Sui, /f s š x/,are matched by voiced fricatives /z ɣ/. The voiced fricative /ɣ/ and /w/ and /y/ are matched by preglottalized /ʔw ʔy ʔɣ/. The Sui vowel system is most like the Mak system in its tonal distinctions --six in both languages.

The Kui or Jui or ɣui dialects are known by many names besides the self designating names which are variants of Kui (2.0), above. The Kui dialects are spoken in Kwangsi, Kweichow, and Yunnan provinces in China, and also in Laos and Thailand. The dialect spoken in the city of Poai (Funing, Yunnan) is stated and restated (Fan Kuei Li, 1957; Eric Hamp, 1957) as distinguishing the usual /l/ from /ɬ/; the latter is voiceless and may be an affricate; and in distinguishing a voiced /y̤/ from the labial and other palatal semivowels or fricatives. Other consonants include: syllabic /n̩ l̩/, /w y/, the three nasals /m n ŋ/, the three fricatives /f š h/, and the oral stops /p t č k/ beside the /ʔ/, which can be phonemicized as an allophone of plus juncture. Thus, the linear distinctions in the Poai dialect of Kui are much the same

as they are in other consonant systems in the group III sample of Kam-Sui languages. The Kui vowels occur in two equally symmetrical co-existing subsystems. The one for short vowels is of the 2 (FCB) type because it distinguishes front-central-back vowels both at high tongue-height, /i ɨ u/; and at low or lower tongue-height, /ɛ a ɔ/. The other for long vowels is of the 3 (FCB) type because it distinguishes front-central-back vowels at three tongue heights, not unlike the single vowel system of Thai of group I, which however makes as many distinctions for short vowels as for long vowels. Six tones are distinguished in Kui.

The Wu-ming dialect described by Li (1947) is flooded with loan words from Chinese, borrowed in different historical periods and from different donor languages and dialects of Han Chinese. In consequence, many have a single etymon but appear in Wu-ming in two or more differently pronounced shapes. In Wu-ming, there are two voiced preglottalized stops, /ʔb ʔd/; the voiceless oral stops distinguish /p t k/beside the glottal stop. But these oral stops are not matched by a contrasting aspirated set. The Wu-ming voiceless stops are matched by fricatives, /f θ x h/ and in addition there is a pharyngealized /ḥ/. So also there is a pharyngealized nasal /ṇ/ besides stop-matching nasals /m n ŋ/. The liquids are /l r/, and the usual semivowels, /w y/, are matched by preglottalized semivowels, /ʔw ʔy/. The vowels in Wu-ming occur in three co-existing subsystems, which are charted in a T-shaped diagram. The vowels above the horizontal of the T belong to the high vowel subsystem; the vowels to the left of the vertical line in T belong to the long vowel subsystem; the vowels to the right of the vertical line in T belong to the short vowel subsystem.

Vowels in the high vowel subsystem, /i ɨ u/, are long in open syllables and short in closed syllables. Vowels in the long vowel subsystem, /e ə a/ are long in all positions. Vowels in the short vowel subsystem, /o ɑ/ are followed by a consonant final or by a vowel in cluster. Long vowels combine with all six tones in open syllables. Short vowels combine only with half of the total inventory of tones (low-falling, mid-rising, low-rising). Long vowels followed by finals (stop consonants) combine with the same three tones that short vowels combine with, and in addition with high-level tone. There are also restrictions on tones after initials. After single glottal stop (or preglottalized voiced stop or semivowel), the tones are restricted to mid-level, high-level, or mid-rising. So also after laryngeal fricative initial, /h/; but after fricative /x/ (and /xw/), the tones are restricted to low-falling, high-falling, low-rising.

The Following Abbreviations Will Be Used

AA	American Anthropologist
ACLS . . .	American Council of Learned Societies
AES-P . . .	American Ethnological Society, Publication
AL	Anthropological Linguistics
APS-P . .	American Philosophical Society, Proceedings
APS-T . . .	American Philosophical Society, Transactions
BAE-B . . .	Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin
BAE-R . . .	Bureau of American Ethnology, Report
CU	Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology
IJAL	International Journal of American Linguistics
IUPAL . . .	Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics
JAF	Journal of American Folklore
JSAP	Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris
Lg	Language
RCPAFL . .	Research Center Publications in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics
SJA	Southwestern Journal of Anthropology
SIL	Studies in Linguistics
TCLP . . .	Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague
UMPL . . .	University of Michigan Publications, Linguistics
UCPAAE . .	University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology
UCPL . . .	University of California Publications in Linguistics
VFPA . . .	Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology
WDWLS . .	William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series

CONTENTS

Impressions of Ryukyuan-Japanese Diversity . . . . .W. W. Elmendorf 1

Sino-Tibetan Fascicle Two . . . . . C. F. and F. M. Voegelin 4

2.0. Introduction and list of Kham-Thai languages 5

2.1. Thai sentences 14

2.2. Sample of phonologies of Kham-Thai languages 46